

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

PHILIP YORK,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 12 C 8824
)	
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES,)	
INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Pro se plaintiff Philip York ("York") has filed a number of complaints in this District Court charging alleged violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act and the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. When this case was assigned at random to this Court's calendar, it granted York's motion for in forma pauperis status.¹ This Court also issued its customary initial scheduling order, after which defendant Capital Management Services, Inc. ("Capital Management") sought and was granted an extension of time to file a responsive pleading, which is now due on February 20.

Today this Court had delivered to its chambers a self-

¹ York's application for such treatment was puzzling in one respect: At one point he reported his free and clear ownership of an \$80,000 condominium, while another part of the application states that he is on welfare. Although this Court gave York the benefit of the doubt the first time around, it would seem that his efforts to treat federal litigation as a cottage industry call for some more penetrating inquiry. Accordingly York is ordered to file a more detailed narrative explanation of his financial situation on or before February 27, 2013.

prepared Amended Complaint. Even though Fed. R. Civ. P. ("Rule") 15(a)(1) permits such an amendment as a matter of course, the sprawling submission that York has now tendered is a clear violation of the Rule 8(a)(2) requirement that a plaintiff provide "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." York's Amended Complaint is stricken sua sponte, and Capital Management's responsive pleading should be directed to his original Complaint.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: February 12, 2013